**EAHR 811 Response – Chapters 5 and 6**

**SQ3R Technique**

As I began to survey and question chapter five, I generated several questions for myself. My main questions were what is the CIPP evaluation model, what is the UCLA evaluation model, and how have management-oriented evaluation approaches been used. As I read through chapter six, I noted a couple more important questions focused on what are Scriven’s suggested criteria for evaluating educational products and how have the consumer-oriented evaluation approaches been used. As I actively read through the chapters and began making comparisons to previous knowledge and readings, I began to find the answers to my questions.

**What is CIPP Evaluation Model?**

Developed by Stufflebeam, an evaluation framework to serve managers and administrators was created and the model acronym CIPP stands for context, input, process and product. The model focuses on four different kinds of decisions:

1. Context evaluation – serves for planning decisions. Involves determining what needs are to be addressed and what programs exist.
2. Input evaluation – serves for structuring decisions. Involves determining what resources are available, what alternatives should be considered, and what plan is the best fit for meeting the program needs.
3. Process evaluation – serves for implementing decisions. Involves determining how well a program is being implemented, what barriers exist, what revisions are needed. Once these elements are determined the program can be monitored, controlled, and refined.
4. Product evaluation – serves for recycling decisions. Involves focusing on program attainments.

Stufflebeam proposes a list of steps that evaluators may follow when designing evaluation:

1. Focusing the evaluation.
2. Collection of information.
3. Organization of information.
4. Analysis of information.
5. Reporting of information.
6. Administration of the evaluation.

In addition, Stufflebeam and Shinkfield summarize the main features of the four types of evaluation used in their model. The summary focuses on the objective, the method, and the relation to decision making in the change process.

**What is the UCLA Evaluation Model?**

Alkin developed an evaluation model that closely paralleled that of Stufflebeam’s CIPP model known as the UCLA model. The UCLA model evidently is not an acronym and instead of focusing only on four types of decisions, Alkin’s model captured five types of evaluation:

1. Systems assessment – involves providing information about the state of a program (similar to context evaluation).
2. Program planning – involves selecting a particular program that is effective in meeting educational needs (similar to input evaluation).
3. Program implementation – involves providing information about program introduction and the appropriateness of the introduction.
4. Program improvement – involves providing information about program function (similar to process evaluation).
5. Program certification – involves providing information about program value and its transferability elsewhere (similar to product evaluation).

**How have Management-Oriented Evaluation Approaches been used?**

The CIPP model has been used in various school districts and state and federal government agencies. This model has been considered to be very useful. Program staff has found this approach to be a useful formative tool to guide program improvement. This approach has also been used for accountability purposes by administrators and boards to facilitate public review of client needs, objectives, plans, activities, and outcomes.

**What are Scriven’s Suggested Criteria for Evaluating Educational Products?**

Predominantly a summative evaluation approach, Scriven made a major contribution to the consumer-oriented approach creating a distinction between the formative and summative components. To adequately evaluate any educational product, Scriven suggests using the following criteria:

* Evidence of achievement of important educational objectives
* Evidence of achievement of important noneducational objectives
* Ensure follow-up results exist and evaluate those results
* Determine any secondary or unintended effects either negative or positive
* Determine the range of utility
* Determine the moral considerations
* Budget all costs (p.101).

Various checklists for educational products and evaluating program evaluations have been developed by Scriven based on the above criteria. The checklists were a result of reviews commissioned by the federal government. Although very stringent, the checklists have expanded producer efforts to create products that better meet the standards.

**How have the Consumer-Oriented Evaluation Approaches been used?**

The consumer-oriented approach has been used extensively by government agencies and independent educational consumer advocates. These agencies have made information available on hundreds of products. Although never implemented, state departments of education and other governmental agencies could create standard forms to compile evaluation information on any new product. The guidelines would need to address four aspects of any product: its processes, content, transportability, and effectiveness.

**PART II – Personal Response**

Based on this week’s readings, I am drawn much more to chapter six and the information about consumer-oriented evaluation approaches compared to that of chapter five on management-oriented evaluation. In my present employment as a new instructor with SIAST, I feel as though I am a consumer each and every day. Presently I do not have a permanent contract and therefore I have not instructed the same course material more than once. As a result, I am continuously prepping for new classes each semester. By creating new preps, I am continuously evaluating course modules, manuals, and textbooks in order to prepare my lesson plans for the upcoming term. Resulting from my lack of seniority and contractual employment, I rarely get the opportunity to voice my opinion on the course products being utilized. I often feel as though I barely get a handle on the course content let alone have the opportunity to perform a thorough evaluation. However, on occasion and without being aware of Scriven’s checklist, I have documented various concerns of my own based on Scriven’s criteria. In due time, I know I will achieve a full-time on-going position with SIAST and at that time I will be able to bring my opinions forward. As with any situation, lack of written documentation limits how serious your product evaluation will be considered. Therefore, I know the more documentation I can create either positive or negative the better I will be able to prepare my case. As each semester ends, I also advocate for my students to be honest on their course evaluation forms with respect to course content and materials in hopes that their voices will be heard, while mine is not.

With respect to the chapter five and the focus on the management-oriented evaluation approach, I found it difficult to bring about any personal reflection. Considering I am not presently in a managerial role at SIAST, the management-oriented evaluation approach does not impact my day-to-day activities as predominantly as the consumer-oriented approach does. Prior to the chapter I was unaware that the CIPP and UCLA models existed. It interests me to know if SIAST management follows either of these evaluation methods and specifically if any, what evaluation method they use. I am very aware that SIAST does place a great deal of emphasis on program evaluation as they consistently want to meet the changing demands of industry in order to offer technologically advanced education to the students it serves. As a new instructor, it is likely wise for me to be more aware of the evaluation tools and models used at SIAST. Knowing this information would definitely assist me in interviews for upcoming employment contracts and also for the future when I finally receive a full-time on-going contract. Being aware of the evaluation preferences of SIAST would assist me in conducting my own course evaluations in order to prepare better feedback and correspondence with management when needed.
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